

Atty Docket No. 2771-594 CIP

REMARKS**Regarding the Amendments**

Claims 1, 7, 18 and 21 have been amended as set forth in the above Complete Listing of the Claims. As amended, the claims are supported by the specification and the original claims.

Specifically, a proviso has been added to each of claims 1, 7, 18 and 21, to recite that all amino functional groups are not simultaneously dimethylamino in the silicon compound. This limitation is fully consistent with and supported by the specification, in which the independent selectability of the amino nitrogen substituents is described. Examples of such silicon compounds include the compounds claimed in claim 13, indicated by the examiner to be allowable.

No new matter, as defined by 35 U.S.C. § 132, has been added in the amended claims.

Accordingly, upon entry of the amendments, claims 1-31 will be pending, of which claims 14-20 and 24-31 have been withdrawn.

The withdrawal of claims 18-20 is discussed below.

Claims 1-13 and 21-23 are presently pending and under active consideration.

Withdrawal of claims 18-20

In the Office Action mailed October 4, 2006, claims 18-20 are stated as being "withdrawn from consideration as not being directed to the elected species." This withdrawal is not understood.

Claim 18 is an independent claim that recites (as currently amended):

18. A composition for chemical vapor deposition of a silicon-containing film on a substrate, said composition comprising (i) one or more disilane derivatives that are fully substituted with alkylamino and/or dialkylamino functional groups, with the proviso that not all functional groups are simultaneously dimethylamino and (ii) one or more hydrocarbon solvents.

Claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 18. Claim 18 was part of Group I, elected in response to the Restriction Requirement mailed July 31, 2006. Accordingly, it is respectfully suggested that the withdrawal of claims 18-20 was an inadvertent oversight, and that such claims should in fact be rejoined with the claims 1-13 and 21-23 under active consideration. Rejoinder of claims 18-

Atty Docket No. 2771-594 CIP

20 is correspondingly respectfully requested.

Objection to the Claims

Claim 13 was objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. It is respectfully submitted that claim 13, pending in its originally filed form, is in fact subsisting in independent form and does not depend from any other claim. Since the Examiner has searched the subject matter of claim 13 and found all three specified compounds to be novel and unobvious, as stated at page 3, paragraph 4 of the October 4, 2006 Office Action, allowance of claim 13 is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 1-12 Under 35 U.S.C. §102

In the October 4, 2006 Office Action, claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Yang et al., *Organometallics* 2000, 19 893-900, "Disilane-Catalyzed and Thermally Induces Oligomerization of Alkynes: A Comparison" (hereinafter "Yang et al.") and Kito, *Chem. Abstract* 1996:212092 and JP 08022986 (hereinafter "Kito").

Such rejection is traversed, in application to claims 1-12 as amended herein.

Anticipation of a claim requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration. (*In re Spada*, 15 USPQ2d 1655 (Fed. Cir., 1990), *In re Bond*, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir., 1990).

The Examiner's attention is respectfully drawn to amended independent claims 1 and 7, set forth above. Each of such amended claims now recites that all amino functional groups are not simultaneously dimethylamino in the claimed silicon compound thereof.

By contrast, both Yang et al. and Kito teach compounds in which all amino functional groups are dimethylamino groups.

Accordingly, the teachings of Yang et al. and Kito do not anticipate the disilane compounds of applicants' claims 1-12.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Yang et al. and Kito is respectfully requested.

Atty Docket No. 2771-594 CIP

of Claims 21-23 Under 35 U.S.C. §102/103

In the October 4, 2006 Office Action, claims 21-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by or, alternatively, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over, Kito.

Applicants traverse such rejection.

Independent claim 21 has been amended correspondingly to amended claims 1 and 7, discussed above.

As amended, claim 21 recites that all amino functional groups are not simultaneously dimethylamino in the claimed silicon compound thereof.

Since Kito teaches a disilane in which all amino functional groups are simultaneously dimethylamino, Kito does not anticipate claims 21-23.

In order for an invention to be obvious, the difference between the subject matter of the application and the prior art must be such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art. To meet this standard, the cited reference(s) must teach or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention.

Kito, however, does not does not teach or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention.

As discussed above, Kito teaches a disilane in which all amino functional groups are simultaneously dimethylamino, which is at odds with the composition of applicants' claimed compounds of claim 21, since in applicants' compounds, all amino functional groups are not simultaneously dimethylamino in the claimed silicon compound.

Kito does not teach or suggest the silicon compound of claim 21, and contains no express or implicit basis from which the compounds of applicants' invention can be derived.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 21-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kito be withdrawn.

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JAN 04 2007**

Atty Docket No. 2771-594 CIP

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all of Applicants' pending claims 1-13 and 21-23 are patentably distinguished over the cited references, and in form and condition for allowance. The Examiner is requested to favorably consider the foregoing remarks in light of the amendments to the claims, as made herein, and to responsively issue a Notice of Allowance.

No fees are believed to be due for the filing of this response. If, however, any fees or amounts are determined to be properly payable for the filing and entry of this response, it is requested that such fees or amounts be charged to Deposit Account No. 08-3284 of Intellectual Property/Technology Law.

If any issues require further resolution, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (919) 419-9350 to discuss same.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 4, 2007

/steven j. hultquist/
Steven J. Hultquist
Reg. No. 28,021
Attorney for Applicants

Date: January 4, 2007

/kelly k. reynolds/
Kelly K. Reynolds
Reg. No. 51,154
Attorney for Applicants

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY/
TECHNOLOGY LAW
Phone: (919) 419-9350
Fax: (919) 419-9354
Attorney File No.: 2771-594 CIP

The USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or credit any overpayment of fees properly payable for this document to Deposit Account No. 08-3284